



Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>TRANSMITTAL FORM</b>  (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10/528,210
	Filing Date	03/17/2005
	First Named Inventor	Stephen R. Smith
	Art Unit	1657
	Examiner Name	Tiffany Maureen Gough
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	3323

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement  <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers  <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Check in the amount of \$255; and Return Postcard
<div>Remarks</div>		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm Name	BECK & TYSVER		
Signature			
Printed name	Stephanie J. James		
Date	6/30/08	Reg. No.	34,437

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:			
Signature			
Typed or printed name	Mary S. Keller	Date	6-30-08

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number

Effective on 12/08/2004.  
Fees pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (H.R. 4818).

# FEE TRANSMITTAL

## For FY 2008

☒ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$) 255.00

### Complete if Known

Application Number	10/528,210
Filing Date	03/17/2005
First Named Inventor	Stephen R. Smith
Examiner Name	Tiffany Maureen Gough
Art Unit	1657
Attorney Docket No.	3323

### METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

- ☒ Check ☐ Credit Card ☐ Money Order ☐ None ☐ Other (please identify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 500246 Deposit Account Name: Beck & Tysver, P.L.L.C.
- For the above-identified deposit account, the Director is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply)
- ☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below ☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee
- ☒ Charge any additional fee(s) or underpayments of fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17 ☐ Credit any overpayments

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

### FEE CALCULATION

#### 1. BASIC FILING, SEARCH, AND EXAMINATION FEES

Application Type	FILING FEES		SEARCH FEES		EXAMINATION FEES		Fees Paid (\$)
	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	
Utility	310	155	510	255	210	105	
Design	210	105	100	50	130	65	
Plant	210	105	310	155	160	80	
Reissue	310	155	510	255	620	310	
Provisional	210	105	0	0	0	0	

#### 2. EXCESS CLAIM FEES

Fee Description	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)
Each claim over 20 (including Reissues)	50	25
Each independent claim over 3 (including Reissues)	210	105
Multiple dependent claims	370	185
<b>Total Claims</b>	<b>Extra Claims</b>	<b>Fee (\$)</b>
- 20 or HP = _____ x _____ = _____		
HP = highest number of total claims paid for, if greater than 20.		
<b>Indep. Claims</b>	<b>Extra Claims</b>	<b>Fee (\$)</b>
- 3 or HP = _____ x _____ = _____		
HP = highest number of independent claims paid for, if greater than 3.		

#### 3. APPLICATION SIZE FEE

If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper (excluding electronically filed sequence or computer listings under 37 CFR 1.52(e)), the application size fee due is \$260 (\$130 for small entity) for each additional 50 sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s).

Total Sheets	Extra Sheets	Number of each additional 50 or fraction thereof	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)
- 100 = _____ / 50 = _____ (round up to a whole number) x _____ = _____				

#### 4. OTHER FEE(S)

Non-English Specification, \$130 fee (no small entity discount)

Other (e.g., late filing surcharge): Filing of Appeal Brief \$255

SUBMITTED BY		
Signature	<u>Stephanie J. James</u>	Registration No. 34,437 (Attorney/Agent)
Name (Print/Type)	Stephanie J. James	Telephone 612-915-9636
		Date <u>6/30/08</u>

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.136. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 30 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCE

Applicant:	Stephen R. Smith et. al	Examiner:	Tiffany Maureen Gough
Serial No.:	10/528,210	Group Art Unit/TC:	1657
Filing Date:	March 17, 2005	Docket No.:	3323
Title	Antimicrobial Composition and Method for Use		

Date of Deposit: 6-30-08

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Signature:

Mary S. Keller

Printed Name: Mary S. Keller

Appeal Brief

Appellant appeals from the final Office Action mailed November 29, 2007, rejecting all pending claims on the basis of obviousness. The Appellant requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's decision and remand the case to the Examiner for allowance.

This brief is filed within two months of the date of filing the notice of appeal and is accompanied by a check for the fee set forth in §41.20(b)(2).

07/07/2008 CNGUYEN2 00000045 10528210

01 FC:2402

255.00 OP

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST .....	3
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES .....	3
III. STATUS OF CLAIMS.....	3
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.....	3
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	3
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	4
VII. ARGUMENT .....	4
VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX.....	15
IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX .....	18
X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX .....	18

**I. Real Party in Interest**

The real party in interest in the above-identified application is Neova Technologies, Inc., the current assignee of record of this application.

**II. Related Appeals and Interferences**

There are no prior or pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceeding known to appellant, the appellant's legal representative, or assignee that is related to, directly affects or would be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**III. Status of Claims**

Claims 49-69 are rejected. Claims 49-69 are appealed.

**IV. Status of Amendments**

All amendments have been entered.

**V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

Claims 49 and 68 are independent. Claims 50-67 depend from claim 49; claim 69 depends from claim 68.

**A. Claim 49**

Claim 49 recites an orally administrable antimicrobial composition for suppressing the growth of enteric pathogens in the gut of livestock. The composition is comprised of three components:

- a) a cell wall lysing substance or its salt;
- b) at least one of dried egg powder and albumen; and
- c) a sequestering agent.

Such a composition is discussed within the specification at page 4, first full paragraph (Paragraph [0010]), using the pagination of PCT publication WO 2004/026334, for example. In this discussion, element “b” is described as “an antimicrobial substance”. Page 4, 5<sup>th</sup> full paragraph (Paragraph [0014]), specifies that “the antimicrobial substance may be dried egg powder and/or albumen.”

**B. Claim 68**

Claim 68 recites an orally administrable antimicrobial composition for treating gastrointestinal infections in livestock. The composition is comprised of four components:

- a) a cell wall lysing substance or its salt;
- b) at least one of dried egg powder and albumen;
- c) a sequestering agent; and
- d) a lantibiotic.

Such a composition is set forth in the specification, for example, at page 6, second full paragraph (Paragraph [0025]). In this discussion, element “b” is described as “a antimicrobial substance”. Page 6, 5<sup>th</sup> full paragraph (Paragraph [0028]), specifies that “the antimicrobial substance may be dried egg powder and/or albumen.”

**VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The Appellant requests review of the obviousness rejections of all pending claims. All pending claims, claims 49-69, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Unilever PLC (EP 0466244 A1, 1992, hereafter “Unilever”) in view of Medipharm (EP 0955061 A1, 1999, hereafter “Medipharm”), Ibrahim (Natural food antimicrobial system, 2000, hereafter “Ibrahim”), and Nippon JP (62145025, 1987, hereafter “Nippon”).

**VII. Argument**

**A. Overview of Appealed Rejection**

The Appellant’s invention is a composition that is taken orally by livestock to combat pathogens within their intestinal system, i.e. in vivo. It is particularly useful in

combating *Clostridium sp.*, *E. coli.*, and *Salmonella sp.* Both independent claims 49 and 68 include a recitation of “at least one of dried egg powder and albumen”.

For all rejections, the Examiner relies primarily upon Unilever that discloses an additive for feedstuffs, cosmetic products or pharmaceutical products and other things that combats the growth of bacteria within these products, particularly during storage and shipment and on the shelf, i.e. ex vivo.

In applying the cited references to make the obviousness rejection, the Examiner notes that the recited element of egg/ albumen is not shown in Unilever. For this egg/ albumen element, the Examiner borrows freeze-dried eggs from Medipharm. The Examiner takes the position that to pluck dried eggs from Medipharm and insert them into the Unilever composition is obvious, particularly in light of the teachings of Ibrahim and Nippon regarding antimicrobial properties of eggs.

The Appellant argues that to arrive at the claimed composition based on the cited art, one must rely upon a primary reference that is non-analogous art. Further, one must piece together disparate references using hindsight, in a manner that would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention. Thus, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made with respect to the independent claims or to the dependent claims.

#### **B. Legal Standards for Determining Obviousness**

As set forth by the Supreme Court in Graham v John Deere Co. of Kansas City, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and reiterated by the Court in KSR Intern. v. Teleflex, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1734 (2007), an objective analysis of obviousness includes consideration of three questions:

[T]he scope and content of the prior art are . . . determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are . . . ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved.

Graham v. John Deere at 17.

**C. Scope and Content of Cited Art and Differences Between the Cited Art and the Claimed Invention**

**1. Unilever is Nonanalogous Art and Therefore Should Not be Used as Prior Art for an Obviousness Rejection**

A prerequisite to making a finding on the scope and content of the prior art is to determine what prior art references are pertinent. In re Clay, 966 F.2d 656, 658 (Fed. Cir. 1992). A reference is analogous if it is from the same field of endeavor as the invention. Id. at 658-659. Similarity in the structure and function of the invention and the prior art is indicative that the prior art is within the inventor's field of endeavor. In re Deminski, 796 F.2d 436, 442 (Fed. Cir. 1986). If a reference is outside the inventor's field of endeavor, it is still analogous art if the reference "is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor is involved." In re Clay, 966 F.2d 656, 659 (Fed. Cir. 1992). See also: State Contracting & Engineering Corp. v. Candotte America, Inc., 346 F.3d 1057, 1069 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

Unilever is the primary reference that the Examiner relies upon in rejecting the claims as obvious. Unilever discloses a mixture shown to have a "much better inhibiting effect on *Listeria monocytogenes*" than other tested compositions. Page 3, lines 55-56. "The main application of [Unilever's] invention is in connection with the production, packaging and storage of food products and the cleaning of equipment used therefor, but the invention can also be applied for non-food uses, examples of which comprise animal feedstuffs, cosmetic products, and pharmaceutical products and their production." Page 3, lines 47-50.

All of the prior art described in Unilever's Background of the Invention (page 2, line 24 through page 3, line 15) is directed to compositions that prevent bacterial growth in food products prior to consumption; no prior art described in Unilever discusses the issue of microbes within the gut of an animal nor how to combat them. Nowhere within Unilever is expressed any interest in or concern for combating microbe growth within the gut of an animal. Nowhere within Unilever is described what would happen to the Unilever compound after it was ingested, i.e. whether it would have any efficacy on pathogens within the intestinal environment. Unilever performs no testing of its composition within an intestinal environment nor in conditions that simulate an intestinal environment.



Thus, it is abundantly clear that Unilever focuses exclusively on the ex vivo problem of safe food preparation, preservation and storage.

In contrast, Appellant's composition focuses exclusively on the in vivo problem of animal health. Thus, Unilever's composition is not in the same field of endeavor as Appellant's composition.

Further, Unilever cannot be considered to be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem the Appellant was seeking to solve. Unilever does not describe, nor is any other art cited that describes, that lysozyme would have any in vivo effect or application. Therefore, there would be no reason that one of skill in the art would select a lysozyme component on which to base a composition for in vivo use.

Accordingly, Unilever is non-analogous art that should not be cited against the Appellant's claims.

**2. Unilever does not disclose egg/albumen component**

The Appellant concurs with the Examiner's assessment that Unilever does not disclose or describe element "b" of claims 49 and 68 (and all claims that depend therefrom): "Unilever differs from the claims in that their composition is not disclosed as containing egg powder or albumen and further to suppress the growth of enteric pathogens, specifically *Clostridium sp.*, *E. coli* and *Salmonella sp.*" Office Action of November 29, 2007, p. 4.

**3. There is No Reason that One Would be prompted to Modify Unilever with Medipharm Eggs**

Because Unilever does not show Appellant's egg element, the Examiner combines Unilever with Medipharm for its use of freeze-dried eggs in an oral product for the prevention and therapy of porcine gastroenteric infections (i.e. the rotavirus, coronaviruses and enteropathogenic and enterotoxigenic bacterial strains of *Clostridium sp.*, *E. Coli* and *Salmonella Sp.*).

The Supreme Court has made clear that there is no per se, rigid rule that a finding of obviousness requires that a motivation to combine references be spelled out in the references. Nevertheless, the Court did recognize that "it can be important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant

field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new invention does.” KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., et al., 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). The Federal Circuit has since noted the necessity to find a reason to combine references to reach a conclusion of obviousness:

As long as the [teaching/motivation/suggestion] test can provide ‘helpful insight’ to an obviousness inquiry. [Citing KSR at 1731.] Thus in cases involving new chemical compounds, it remains necessary to identify some reason that would have led a chemist to modify a known compound in a particular manner to establish prima facie obviousness of a new claimed compound.

Takeda Chemical Industries, Ltd. v. Alphapharm Pty. Ltd., 492 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

The Appellant has not found, and the Examiner has not cited, any reason or motivation within the text of the Unilever patent to modify it in any way that would address the problem of inhibiting growth of enteric pathogens in the gut of livestock. And, more specifically, the Appellant has not found, and the Examiner has not cited, any reason or motivation in Unilever to add Medipharm’s freeze-dried eggs for any purpose.

Further, the Appellant does not find, and the Examiner has not cited, any reason or motivation within the text of the Medipharm patent to use the composition of Unilever or any other composition having antimicrobial activity occurring ex vivo and adapted for suppressing the growth of *Listeria* bacteria in products, and adding egg or albumen to suppress enteric pathogens in the gut of livestock (i.e. in vivo).

In the absence of any motivation within these references themselves, the Examiner turns to Ibrahim and Nippon to provide a reason that one would add Medipharm’s eggs to Unilever’s composition. These references, however, cannot serve to provide a reason to include egg or albumen in just any antimicrobial composition. The Appellant’s claimed composition has a component known to kill certain microbes ex vivo (i.e. lysozyme to kill *Listeria monocytogenes*). Appellant’s claimed composition has a component known to kill certain microbes in vivo (i.e. freeze-dried eggs to kill *Clostridium*, *E. Coli* and *Salmonella*). However, there existed no teaching nor motivation nor suggestion in any of the cited art to combine an ex vivo agent with an in vivo agent, and particularly no such teaching that such combination would be more effective

against enteric pathogens than freeze-dried eggs without a lyzing substance or its salt. This is a critical leap of imagination and invention that yields the claimed composition and is not in any way revealed by any of the cited art.

The Appellant notes that the Examiner has not offered a single example of an ex vivo antimicrobial composition (like Unilever) being adapted to be effective in fighting bacteria in vivo.

Moreover, there are additional reasons why a person skilled in the art would not be brought to combine the references as suggested by the Examiner. In the absence of a teaching in one of the cited references, a person skilled in the art would not automatically assume that the antimicrobial composition of Unilever which is effective in suppressing *Listeria* bacteria on a product, would also be effective (when combined with egg or albumen) to suppress enteric pathogens in the gut of livestock. The bacteria addressed by Unilever and the Appellant are different, and these different bacteria require and thrive in very different environments, i.e. pH, temperature, water content or activity, co-existence with other bacteria, etc. There is no teaching in Unilever that the lysozyme composition would be able to withstand the gastric digestion within the gut of livestock.

Because of these differences, one skilled in the art could not readily conclude, based on the bacterial suppression of the Unilever composition applied to a product ex vivo, that the Unilever composition, as modified under the Examiner's proposal, would have any effectiveness whatsoever against enteric pathogens in the gut of livestock.

Thus, the Appellant asserts that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness because the Examiner has not provided a reason to combine Medipharm's eggs with Unilever's composition, and in this situation, involving the purported transformation of an ex vivo application to an in vivo application, a showing of reason should be necessary. Appellant therefore submits that claims 49 and 68 (and all claims depending therefrom) are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

#### **4. There Was Not a Finite Number of Options to Modify Unilever**

Presuming someone of skill in the art were motivated to modify Unilever to create an in vivo antibacterial composition, the addition of eggs or albumen was not an obvious choice. A person of ordinary skill, equipped with ordinary creativity, would

have been faced with a large number of potential agents to add to combat in vivo bacteria, so the selection of egg would have required an inventive inspiration.

The Supreme Court has noted the importance that there be “a finite number of identified, predictable solutions” for a combination to be obvious:

When there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp.

KSR at 1742.

In finding non-obviousness a treatment composition for diabetes, where the cited art was a composition for treating epilepsy, the Federal Circuit noted that the number of solutions need not only be finite, but also small within the context of the art:

The passage above in KSR posits a situation with a finite, and in the context of the art, small or easily traversed, number of options that would convince an ordinarily skilled artisan of obviousness.

Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. Mylan Laboratories, Inc., 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

The Appellant asserts that had someone of skill been motivated to start with the Unilever composition and modify it for an in vivo application to combat enteric pathogens, the person would have been faced with a huge number of options for substances to add.

While performing research and development work in connection with the claimed invention, the inventors combined the following antimicrobials either with lysozyme alone or with lysozyme and EDTA in an attempt to arrive at an antimicrobial composition effective against enteric pathogens, before determining that the claimed composition offered better results than any of these attempted combinations:

**Antimicrobial peptides:**

Protamine  
Lactoferricin  
Lactoperoxidase  
Lactoferrin  
Monolaurin  
Glycine  
L-lysine

Glucosamine  
Phospholipase (PA2)

**Natural plant extracts:**

Liquid smoke  
Mace extract  
Rosemary extract  
Ginger extract  
Tea tree oil  
Licorice extract  
Olive oil  
Bioflavonoid (Vitamin P)  
Angelica dahurica extract  
Angelica pubescens extract  
Astragal extract  
Black tea extract  
Burnet extract  
Chinese tea extract  
Fennel extract  
Geranium extract  
Green tea extract (Sunphenon)  
Honeysuckle extract  
Hops extract  
Houttuynia extract  
Isodon extract  
Ivy extract  
Coptis extract  
Mukurossi extract  
Peach leaf extract  
Phellodendron extract  
Polygonatum extract  
Sage extract  
Sophora extract  
Sweet bay extract  
Yucca extract  
Zanthoxylum extract  
Perillaldehyde  
Grapefruit seed extract  
Xanthones  
Chromone derivatives  
Willow bark extract

**Organic acid and their salts:**

Ascorbic acid  
L-Glutamic acid  
Sodium acetate  
Usinic acid  
Sodium Propionate  
Propylparaben

**Other compounds:**

D-sorbitol  
Sarkosyl  
Mutanolysin  
Dermasoft  
Psammaplin A  
Variolin A (alkaloids)  
N(3')-methyltetrahydrovariolin B  
Meridine  
Dermaseptin (adenoregulin)  
Sinharines  
Penimides  
Illukumbins  
Farnesol  
Phenoxyethanol

**5. The Art of Record Does Not Teach as Much as the Examiner Ascribes to It**

On page 9, lines 4-10 of the Action, the Examiner purports to set forth that which is taught in the cited references as follows:

However, the art of record clearly teaches the claimed composition's components, which are effective in treating and preventing gastrointestinal infections caused by enteric pathogens such as those claimed, i.e. *Clostridium sp.*, *Salmonella sp.*, *E. Coli*. Further, the claimed components; EDTA, citric acid, nisin, lysozyme and albumen, of applicant's compositions are well known for their bacteriostatic/bactericidal effectiveness against both gram positive and gram-negative bacteria.

The Examiner cites no page or line numbers in the cited art for these purported teachings. The Appellant submits that the Examiner's representation as to the teachings of these references is unfounded. The Examiner asserts, incorrectly, that the cited references offer teachings with regard to each component of the composition with regard to enteric pathogens. For example, Unilever offers no teaching of components for treating or preventing *Clostridium*, *Salmonella* or *E. Coli*, and more specifically, none of the art shows a use of lysozyme for combating gastro-intestinal microbes. The Examiner's statement regarding the prior art is inaccurate and exaggerates what is shown in the art.

## 6. The Appellant's Composition Offers Synergistic Effects

As described throughout the Appellant's specification, the Appellant's composition provides synergistic effects that would not be expected from the known qualities of its components. In paragraph 48 (referencing the WIPO publication of the present application):

In a pilot study, it has been shown that by adding dried egg powder and a sequestering/metal-chelating agent, . . . , there is an increased efficacy for inhibiting *Clostridium perfringens*. It is anticipated that this is due to synergistic effects between lysozyme, dried egg powder and the sequestering/metal-chelating agent. Experimental data relating to the synergies between lysozyme, citric acid and albumen are shown in Figure 2.

Further, in paragraph 50 (referencing the WIPO publication of the present application):

There is also some indication that the sequestering agent/metal-chelating agent, i.e. citric acid, may also help to prevent the growth of Gram negative pathogens such as *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella*. In a further pilot study using Blend 1, it was found that there was an increase in antimicrobial activity against Gram negative pathogens. It has been suggested that the reason for this is that the sequestering/metal-chelating agent works as an anti-oxidant and is synergistic with lysozyme in these situations. By keeping the individual gut of livestock... more acidic, the overall effectiveness of inhibiting *Clostridium perfringens* and other pathogens may be increased.

The Examiner has cited no art that describes that such effects would be expected. In particular, the Examiner has cited no art that describes that maintaining an acidic gut with one component in a compound will increase the effectiveness of other components in the same compound.

Further, the synergistic effect of combining the three recited components yields a composition that is cheaper, given its effectiveness, than would be a composition with only two of recited components. As described in the specification at paragraph 48-49:

Figure 2 illustrates that there is an efficacy for inhibiting *Clostridium perfringens* at approximately 50 ppm when using the above-described Blend 1 on MIC plates. It should be noted that, although the relative amount of lysozyme used in the present pilot study decreased compared to the concentration used in the pilot study of Figure 1, the efficacy of the composition increased. It is also important to note that lysozyme represents only a fraction of Blend 1 used in the presently described pilot study (50 ppm) that led to the generation of the data illustrated in Figure 2. An advantage of this embodiment of the invention is the relative low costs of both albumen and citric acid as compared to lysozyme.

## 7. Secondary Considerations

Under Graham, evidence of secondary consideration, such as "commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, failure of others, etc., might be utilized to give light to the circumstances surrounding the origin of the subject matter sought to be patented." Graham v. John Deere, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966).

The Appellant has not submitted evidence regarding secondary considerations during prosecution of this case, believing that the inquiry into the first three Graham questions yields a conclusion of nonobviousness and therefore evidence of secondary considerations is not necessary at this time.

## D. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art


The level of skill in the art of veterinary medicine or animal pathology is high. However, it does not extend to the non-analogous arena of preservation or preventing spoilage of foodstuffs, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals and other products.

## CONCLUSION

The Appellant respectfully requests a decision by the Board that the claims are not obvious in light of the cited art.

Respectfully submitted,  
Neova Technologies, Inc.  
By its attorneys:

Date: 6/30/08



Stephanie J. James  
Registration No. 34,437  
Beck & Tysver, P.L.L.C.  
2900 Thomas Ave., #100  
Minneapolis, MN 55416  
Telephone: (612) 915-9636  
Fax: (612) 915-9637



**VIII. Claims Appendix****Claim 49:**

An orally administrable antimicrobial composition for suppressing the growth of enteric pathogens in the gut of livestock, the antimicrobial composition comprising:

- (a) a cell wall lysing substance or its salt;
- (b) at least one of dried egg powder and albumen; and
- (c) a sequestering agent.

**Claim 50:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 49, wherein the enteric pathogens include members of the following families of bacteria: *Clostridium perfringens*, *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella Typhimurium* and *Salmonella Mbandaka*.

**Claim 51:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 49, wherein the cell wall lysing substance or its salt is lysozyme.

**Claim 52:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 49, wherein the antimicrobial composition includes both dried egg powder and albumen.

**Claim 53:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 52, wherein the sequestering agent is an organic acid.

**Claim 54:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 53, wherein the sequestering agent is a metal-chelator.

**Claim 55:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 53, wherein the sequestering agent is selected from the group consisting of: (a) disodium ethylenediamine tetraacetate (EDTA); (b) citric acid; (c) chitosan.

**Claim 56:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 49 further includes a lantibiotic.

**Claim 57:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 56, wherein the lantibiotic is nisin.

**Claim 58:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 56, wherein the ratio of the cell wall lysing substance or its salt, the at least one of dried egg powder and albumen, the sequestering agent and the lantibiotic, is 50:150:50:20 by weight.

**Claim 59:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 49, wherein the antimicrobial composition is in powdered form.

**Claim 60:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 49, wherein the antimicrobial composition is in aqueous solution form.

**Claim 61:**

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 60, wherein the antimicrobial composition is water-soluble to allow the antimicrobial composition to be mixed with drinking water for administration to the livestock.

## Claim 62:

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 49, wherein the antimicrobial composition is a feed additive.

## Claim 63:

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 49, wherein the ratio of the cell wall lysing substance or its salt, the at least one of dried egg powder and albumen and the sequestering agent, is 2:5:3 by weight.

## Claim 64:

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 49 further including dried egg powder, the dried egg powder being capable of suppressing additional microbes in the livestock gut.

## Claim 65:

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 64 wherein the additional microbes include molds and viruses.

## Claim 66:

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 49 wherein the antimicrobial composition includes dried egg powder and the dried egg powder is capable of suppressing additional enzymes in the livestock gut.

## Claim 67:

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 66 wherein the additional enzymes include proteases and lipases.

## Claim 68:

An orally administrable antimicrobial composition for treating gastrointestinal infections in livestock, the antimicrobial composition comprising:

- (a) a cell wall lysing substance or its salt;
- (b) at least one of dried egg powder and albumen;

- (c) a sequestering agent; and
- (d) a lantibiotic.

Claim 69:

The orally administrable antimicrobial composition according to claim 68 wherein the gastrointestinal infections include necrotic enteritis, *Clostridium perfringens* enteritis and diarrheal disease.

**IX. Evidence Appendix**

None.

**X. Related Proceedings Appendix**

None.